

<b>Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 09/639,915	<b>Applicant(s)</b> SNYDER ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> Robert C. Scheibel	<b>Art Unit</b> 2666	

**All Participants:**

(1) Robert C. Scheibel.

(2) Steven L. Webb.

**Status of Application:** \_\_\_\_\_

(3) \_\_\_\_\_

(4) \_\_\_\_\_

**Date of Interview:** 9 December 2004

**Time:** 3:55 PM

**Type of Interview:**

☒ Telephonic  
☐ Video Conference  
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No  
 If Yes, provide a brief description:

**Part I.**

Rejection(s) discussed:

  
  

Claims discussed:

1 and 11

Prior art documents discussed:

U.S. Patent 6,311,212, U.S. Patent 6,724,767, and U.S. Patent Application Publication 2004/022107.1

**Part II.**

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

**Part III.**

☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.  
☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

\_\_\_\_\_  
 (Examiner/SPE Signature)

\_\_\_\_\_  
 (Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: There were a total of four different conversations between the parties listed above to agree on the claims as amended herein. The first conversation took place at 3:55 PM (EST) on 12/9/2004. Examiner explained that he felt the original reference (6,311,212) could still be applied to the claims as amended. We discussed some possible amendments to the claims to better distinguish the invention from this prior art. Mr. Webb agreed to email a proposed draft of the claims.

The second conversation took place at 5:05 PM (EST) on 12/13/2004. Examiner presented the documents that the updated search produced (6,724,767 and 2004/0221071) and explained his opinion on how a potential 103 rejection using these references would be crafted. Mr. Webb asked for some time to consider the references in detail.

The third conversation took place at 8:00 AM (EST) on 12/16/2004. Discussed the new references (6,724,767 and 2004/0221071) and agreed upon an additional limitation that distinguishes the invention from the two pieces of prior art.

The fourth conversation took place at 5:00 PM (EST) on 12/16/2004. Examiner Scheibel requested some additional changes for clarity. "Event" was replaced with "packet" in claims 1 and 11.